Dear Dr. Fisher:

It is very probable that you have caused me more consternation than I have caused you.

I am sending carbons of this letter to each of the other panel members along with photostatic copies of my letters to you of January 2, 1970 and March 3, 1970. Your association with the other members has become increasingly bizarre to me as your position on the panel itself becomes increasingly disturbing.

In retrospect, my letter of November 16, 1969 to you was a wasted effort for it brought out facts of which you must have been aware being a forensic pathologist. You transmitted copies of that letter to the other Panel members. To this I have no objection, for they too participated in the examination. I originally addressed the letter to you since it was my understanding that you were the only practicing forensic pathologist on the panel.

However, the fact that you have given me no indication of transmitting copies of my letter to you of 1/2/70 to the other members leaves me with serious doubts. You saught the "advice" of the others when I made charges which you know your report obviates. Yet, when I ask the questions which you ~~also~~ likewise know your report does not answer, you keep the other members uninformed. I consider it more than possible that you sent my second letter to the other members to intimidate them, as I have good reason to believe that at least one member was intimidated. I do now regret that I did not XKMX originally send each member a copy of my letter of 1/2/70, my third to you.

Your apparently last intended letter to me which states that you cannot carry on an endless correspondance with people studying the case does not in the least way discourage me for three other men took part in this project. Perhaps they will see fit to provide the information inexcusably absent from the Panel report. Perhaps they have a little more respect for their country, for history. And I believe I indicated anything but an "endless" correspondance. I made every effort not to pressure XXX or rush you in any way. And it was you, sir, by submitting an incomplete report to the Attorney General, who necessitated such correspondance, not researchers such as myself.

personal integrity also as- sumed responsibilities

It is XXXXXXX not my intent to be insolent or bitter. I began my inquirey into the panel very innocently, seeking answers to honest questions. I believe I have not yet asked one question which did not deserve an answer and which the existing record does not answer. Yet, the shenanigans which have been exposed to me in this correspondance can only lead me to wonder.

I asked each one of the panel members to clarify the purpose of the panel examination. Not only did I receive four conflicting answers from three members, but each answer conflicted with the purpose stated in the Panel report itself which conflicted with the purpose stated in the government brief which gave begrudging light to the once secret report. So I ask you and each of the members, although not asking for an answer, if I or anyone should believe that there was any real purpose to the examination of the valuable autopsy material.

Yet, all of the contradictory assurances of the honest and objective purposes of the Panel have little meaning in light of how the report was so severely misused. The finding of the report itself is that the materials examined "supported" (though they could not confirm) the extremely limited portions of the autopsy report and Warren Report it chose to ~~previously~~ quoted. It did not, and, assuming ~~XM~~ as I do that you are all reasonable men, you know it did not in anyway confirm the whole of either the autopsy or the Warren reports. However, it was released in an effort to refute Jim Garrison's contention of exactly that--that the photographs and X-rays would not support the Warren Report. And the American press was 100% consistant in falsely reporting that your report backed up the Warren Report. Though I have searched, I have yet to find one instance in which any panel member made any effort to correct both the government's and the press' misuse of the report to which he affixed his name.

You have expressed a distinct distaste for what you call "nit-picking" in this case. Yet, when I write serious letters in the hopes of eliminating such "nit-picking" from writing in this field, you cannot be bothered. I honestly hope there are some left who can be bothered.

As I stated in my letter of 1/2/70, the key observation is not that the bullet came from the rear. As you undoubtedly know, there were ~~are~~ approximately 3 blocks composing what was "rear" to President Kennedy ~~as "rear."~~ The Warren Commission chose but one specific spot as the source of the shots. There is nothing whatsoever in your report or your letters which could possibly indicate that you speak of the same rear as did the Commission. And if there was nothing in what you saw that could enable to say so, then ~~XXX~~ there is no basis to say that your report did anything near to supporting the Warren Commission's findings. If you found anything in the photographs and X-rays which proved that the shots came from the one source postulated by the Commission, then please inform me of such.

There is also the question of who committed the crime. The Commission produced what it alleged to be the murder weapon. Yet, as I have said, I find no citation of proof in your report that both the fatal and non-fatal injuries were caused by the alleged ammunition. And I have repeatedly submitted to you that military bullets such as those fired from the Mannlicher-Carcano cannot fragment in soft tissue without striking bone. I have asked and still do ask how you explain the presence of fragments in Presindet Kennedy's neck. The official contention is that the bullet which penetrated the neck struck no bones. Dr. Morgan has indicated to me the possibility that this bullet grazed a transverse process and thereby dislodged fragments. Then, I ask you to explain how the bullet alleged to have gone through the neck is without deformity, with all of its jacket intact.

within

why did [illegible] not in report

I also asked and still do ask how you could identify the front neck wound as a bullet wound and not as a result of the tracheostomy. Likewise, I ask what about the "wound" made it "characteristic" of an axit wound, and how it could be as small as described by those who saw its original state ~~XXX~~ yet be the result of a 6.5mm. bullet which, by the fragments you say it left behind, must have been distorted. Unless, as I have reason to suspect, the bullet was less than 6.5mm. in diamter.

8

Unless you held some superior position on the panel which is not reflected in your report, I do not understand why Dr. Moritz tells me that information not in the report could be gotten only through you while the two other doctors give me information entirely on their own or why, as your letter of 3/9/70 indicates, it was your responsibility to present the report to the AG. And I am more than distubbed that you consider this your only committment, since I take it to mean that responsible reporting of what you saw, as well as honesty in what you wrote were not "committments" to you.

Complete mss

It goes without saying that I have been extremely disillusioned by what has transpired with the panel. But I have not given up, and, I might add, I was not "born yesterday." I still expect answers to the questions posed in this letter as well as that of 1/2/70. And there are other questions such as: Although you cannot "positively identify" the rectangular structure in the brain, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ can you make any not so "positive" identifications of it, even if it is merely the impression you received upon looking at it? Can you be certain that there were no other missiles in the body when your inventory indicates that you never saw X-rays of the extremities? [illegible] Or can you be sure that the internal damage to the neck and thorax was as described in the autopsy report and Commander Humes' testimony when the inventory also discloses your failure to see photographs of that area?

16 yrs ago

& why not in 4 yrs?

I do hope you will understand that I have been doing and will continue to do everything within my power to have my questions answered. Likewise, I hope that, if you still refuse to respond in spite of all my efforts to burden you the least, the other members will see fit to help me out with the answers I seek. I have every intention of publishing in this area, and if I am further denied the information to which I have every right, then the story I ~~am~~ be forced to write shall be less than a complimentary one to any of the panel members.

re Justice